

January 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2437

3. WAGES

The central point of the past 5 years' history in this country is that economic forces, like those of nature, can be shaped to human purpose without compromising the principles of the free society. Three myths have given way before the exercise of purposive good sense: that there had to be cycles of depression and prosperity; that the price of technological advance had to be unemployment; and that poverty was implacable.

Now the question is raised whether the price of prosperity in this country has to be, as it has so often been in the past, wage and price inflation; or more particularly, so far as the subject of today's discussion is concerned, whether there can be full employment without creating wage increase pressures which will lead to inflationary spiraling.

There is already, at the 5-year point in this period of unprecedented economic growth, considerable disproof of the theories of the inevitability of wage and price inflation in a period of advancing prosperity and decreasing unemployment.

Wage increases have stayed in line, in general, with increasing productivity. In fact, real compensation per man-hour rose at an average rate of 3 percent a year between 1960 and 1965, which was less than the increase in productivity.

Unit labor costs have remained remarkably level. In manufacturing industries, they rose only one-fifth of 1 percent a year during the 5-year period between 1959 and 1964. That compared with an average rise in manufacturing unit labor costs of 3.2 percent a year during the preceding 12-year period. And while these costs stayed virtually level in this country between 1959 and 1964, they went up by 11 percent in Japan, 12 percent in the United Kingdom, 15 percent in Sweden, 21 percent in West Germany, 27 percent in France, and 28 percent in the Netherlands.

In 1965, just ended, there were larger increases in both wages and prices than had been true in the preceding 4 years.

A study of major collective bargaining agreements negotiated during the first 9 months of 1965 shows annual average wage increases during the period of the contract of 3.3 percent. (The first year average increase was 4.2 percent, with substantially lower increases during subsequent years.) This study does not include fringe benefits in either the increases or the base upon which the increase percentages are computed.

Two recent surveys of union wage scale changes in the building and construction industry (not included in the study referred to in the preceding paragraph) show that union scales in seven key trades were 3.9 percent higher in January 1965 than in January 1964; and that the rise between July 1964 and July 1965 (using a broader coverage of trades) was 4.1 percent. A comparison of average hourly earnings in this industry for the year 1965 as a whole shows a substantially smaller increase over the 1964 average than is reflected in the scale changes. On the other hand, inclusion of fringes along with the scale changes indicates an even larger increase than in the wage rates taken alone.

There are no comprehensive surveys of smaller collective bargaining agreement adjustments (i.e., in terms of number of employees involved) available for 1965. Previous experience indicates that they average less, in terms of wage and fringe increases, than the major agreements. Preliminary reports on wage movements in establishments which are not unionized indicate that they were probably higher, on the average, than those in organized establishments.

The information which is presently available indicates that average compensation per

man-hour in the private economy increased by 3.7 percent in 1965. Average hourly earnings for factory production workers, including premium pay for overtime, increased by 3.1 percent (on a December-to-December basis).

This is the wage record to date. It is, in general, a healthy record. The public notice which has understandably and properly been focused on those cases in which there have been excessive wage increases has tended to obscure the larger fact that the last 5 years have witnessed, overall, an unparalleled demonstration of responsible self-restraint. The future is less clear.

It is a relevant practical fact that comparatively few major collective bargaining agreements will be negotiated this year.

A good deal of significance attaches to the effectiveness with which the prospective, or potential, manpower shortage situations are met.

It is plain that there will be a strong interaction between what happens to prices and what happens to wages.

Secretary Fowler, Chairman Ackley, and Director Schultz have discussed with the committee the fiscal measures which the President is proposing to the Congress to assure continued stable growth.

There have been adjustments in the national monetary policy.

In addition to this, the President and all of the members of his administration have made clear their commitment to the principles of the stabilization policies embodied in the President's economic message and in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers. This commitment is reflected in a series of affirmative, and in general effective, actions.

The future remains in the hands of the private decisionmakers—which is right in a democracy. The evidence is that the key decisions will be made responsibly, and with sufficient realization that the historic gains of the past 5 years depend upon the continued exercise of this responsibility.

I shall be glad to respond to your questions.

VIETNAM

MR. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly to make the following observation:

During the past several weeks I have noted the issuance of many statements by my colleagues in the Senate relating to the involvement of our Nation in southeast Asia.

I have also noted press reports indicating that there are some Members of the Senate who felt that the action we took on August 6, 1964, in adopting Senate Joint Resolution 189 did not in any way endorse the actions taken by the President.

If I may, I should like to read from the committee report, which was issued on August 6, 1964. The first two paragraphs of the committee report read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, herein-after referred to as the joint committee, having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 189 supporting the President's determination to repel any armed attack against U.S. forces in southeast Asia and to prevent further Communist attacks, report the resolution favorably and recommend that it be passed by the Senate.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The basic purpose of this resolution is to make it clear that the Congress approves the actions taken by the President to meet the

attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia by the Communist regime in North Vietnam. Full support by the Congress also is declared for the resolute policy enunciated by the President in order to prevent further aggression, or to retaliate with suitable measures should such aggression take place.

On August 5, 1964, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress. The message is incorporated in the committee report from which I have read. I wish to quote from the President's message, as follows:

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

The committee report concludes as follows:

The President's message and Senate Joint Resolution 189, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT (for himself and Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator RUSSELL, and Senator SALTONSTALL) to give effect to the Presidential recommendations, by unanimous consent were referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. During the morning of August 6 the joint committee, with Senator FULBRIGHT presiding in executive session, heard Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

After receiving the testimony the joint committee voted 31 to 1 to report the resolution favorably without amendment.

I am certain that all Members of the Senate have studied this document with great care, because it reports upon a resolution of great significance and importance. I am certain that Senators, in casting their votes in support of the adoption of the resolution, did so only after careful study and consideration.

SENATOR CLARK'S SPEECH BEFORE THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 5 years ago, population control was a politically taboo subject. Today I think that most Americans agree with President Johnson that a solution to the population explosion is a cause second only in importance to the search for peace. This change in public attitudes came about because farsighted and bold men were willing to speak out.

No man has spoken out more intelligently and courageously on the problem of population control than the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. JOSEPH CLARK was the first man to discuss population control on the floor of the Senate and has consistently encouraged planned parenthood programs in Pennsylvania and throughout the United States.

Recently Senator CLARK delivered a thoughtful address at the annual luncheon of the Planned Parenthood Association of Philadelphia, summarizing the progress made so far in this field, and urging that appropriate local, State, and Federal authorities play a more active role in making birth control information

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 8, 1966

and advice available on a strictly voluntary basis. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLARK's address be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

I

The duty of a politician is not to follow but to lead his constituents in seeking solutions to problems of public concern. But, if he wants to remain an active, rather than a former, public servant, he had better not get so far ahead of his public that he gets shot in the rear.

I have long been an active, if private, supporter of planned parenthood. To me the right to know what needs to be done to prevent the birth of unwanted children is one of the basic freedoms of a just and a compassionate society. To deny that right is unethical, immoral and wicked.

It was not until I was reelected to the Senate in 1962 that I had the courage to speak out. That fall, before the election, I promised my wife that if I won in November I would make my position clear early in the next year. It was not, however, until August 15, 1963, that I addressed the Senate on the topic "The Time Has Come To Speak Out on the Problem of Population Control."

I was, I believe, the first U.S. Senator to so speak out. Since that time I have been followed by Senators GRUENING, TYDINGS, BASS, BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, HART, McGOVERN, MOSS, SIMPSON, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG.

The support of Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, born and brought up in Bryn Mawr, Pa., a Roman Catholic, the father of eight children and one of the most conscientious, high minded men in the Senate, is particularly heartening to me. I should also note that, upon his retirement from the Senate, Kenneth Keating, of New York, now a Judge on the New York Court of Appeals, assumed the presidency of the Population Crisis Committee and, all through 1965, performed yeoman service in calling to the attention of the country the seriousness of the population crisis and the need to take prompt action to resolve it.

In the House of Representatives many Congressmen have also spoken up, among them UDALL, DIGGS, MOSS, CONYERS, MACKAY, BROWN, and LONG.

Not all of these men, by any means, can be categorized as "starry-eyed liberals." A number of them usually follow conservative principles.

At the executive level, former President Eisenhower has spoken out, much to his credit, having reversed a stand he had previously taken. In a letter written June 22 or last year to Senator GRUENING, who has been holding most useful hearings on legislation to create executive secretaries for population in both the State and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, President Eisenhower wrote:

"Unless something is done to bring an essential equilibrium between human requirements and available supply, there is going to be not only a series of riotous explosions but a lowering of the standards of all people, including our own. * * * I devoutly hope that necessary measures will be enacted into law * * * so * * * that human and material resources can be promptly mobilized and employed to cope effectively with the great need of slowing down and finally stabilizing the growth of the world's population."

President Johnson has been equally forthright on a number of occasions. In his state of the Union message last year, he said:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

At the 20th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco on June 25, 1965, he said:

"Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

The White House Conference on Health which met in Washington on November 3 and 4, 1965, had a panel on family planning which reported:

"There is wide general agreement that the time has come in this country to take definitive steps to make family planning services a part of routine medical practice and readily available to those who desire it—particularly those who have previously been unable to secure either information or service. All parts of government must take leadership in cooperation with private groups to establish and maintain family planning services with the understanding that there shall be no coercion and that there is a full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy. This goal is believed to be in accord with the present wishes of a majority of people of all faiths, of all social and economic levels."

Assuredly, the climate of opinion toward the cause of planned parenthood has changed drastically in the last 3 years.

II

There has indeed been a breakthrough, which I date from the publication of Dr. John Rock's book, "The Time Has Come," early in 1963, with its introduction by former Secretary of State Christian Herter. As most of you know, Dr. Rock is a well-known Catholic professor emeritus of gynecology at the Harvard Medical School. The subtitle of his book is: "A Catholic Doctor's Proposals To End the Battle Over Birth Control."

In a review of Dr. Rock's book quoted in the New York Times on April 20, 1963, Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, who delivered the invocation at the inauguration ceremonies of President Kennedy in 1961, wrote:

"The Church is not opposed to birth control as such but to the use of artificial means to control births."

In a speech delivered before the Planned Parenthood Federation lunch at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington on May 8, 1963, Dr. Rock said that Catholic doctrine today is no obstacle to a massive program of Government action on the population problem; that many Catholic scholars are as concerned with the tragic consequences of over population and the encouragement of responsible parenthood as are non-Catholics; and that authoritative Catholic teaching encompassed a broad approach of toleration toward those areas of public policy on which there are remaining disagreements. He further stated that, while he did not expect the Catholic Church to reverse its longstanding opposition to artificial contraception, differences of religious approach did not mean that we must be paralyzed:

"In the event of such disagreements, the only democratic solution is enactment of laws and adoption of policies by each public body which respects the deeply held convictions of all groups. Such a policy would remove all restrictions on birth control in public agencies offering all methods so that communicants of all faiths can choose a method in accord with their beliefs."

As reported in the New York Times, June 24, 1965, Cardinal Cushing, speaking about

the effort to repeal the Massachusetts birth control law which prohibited the sale of contraceptive devices said:

"I do not see where I have the obligation to impose my will on those who do not accept the faith I do."

There is now, I believe, an overwhelming consensus in this country—but not in this city—that both information and contraceptive devices should be made available to every human being who wishes to exercise his or her right to know how to prevent conception of an unwanted child. And this consensus includes an overwhelming majority of all three major religious groups, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—including the inhabitants of this city—but not its leadership.

Recent polls show that 8 out of 10 Americans think birth control information should be made available to anyone who wants it. Two years ago, 53 percent of the Catholics interviewed were of this view; by last summer the percentage had increased to 78. These are national figures; but there is no reason to think that the percentages are any different in Philadelphia. Planned parenthood clinics report that their clinics include Catholics in a number at least equal to their percentage in a particular community.

A survey conducted in the South by Dr. Joseph Beasley shows that three out of every four Negro women interviewed did not want any more children, but that more than half of them did not know how to stop having them. I suspect that Negro leaders who do not recognize this fact and act accordingly will not long remain the leaders of their people.

I like to think of myself as a practical politician. As such, I have no hesitation in telling you that espousal of the cause of planned parenthood is, in my judgment today, a political asset and not a liability. As Dr. Rock so cogently put it: The time has come to speak out.

III

Let's define more closely what we are talking about. We are concerned primarily with two matters: first, methods; and second, relations between church and state and private agencies. Would not the members of this organization agree with me?

First, that all tested and medically supported methods of voluntarily preventing conception should be made available to all married couples and also, under proper safeguards, to those unmarried mothers from underprivileged social groups who presently have no practical way, in view of the environment in which they live, of protecting themselves from the unwanted child.

Second, that dissemination of this information and the services required to make it effective should be supported not only by voluntary civic organizations such as yours but by the local, State, and Federal governments as well.

Third, that the program should be entirely voluntary, entirely without coercion and that those who have religious scruples should be free to reject the information if they so desire.

Fourth, that the program is an essential part of any successful war on poverty at home or abroad.

Fifth, that both at home and especially abroad, methods of curbing the presently excessive rate of population increase must promptly be put into effect to protect the well-being of the human race and perhaps, indeed, its very survival.

As President Johnson has said: "This cause is second only to the search for peace."

IV

It would be carrying coals to New Castle to dwell at further length on the need for a program of population control. You are all aware of the basic facts. I shall mention only a few in passing: